



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE WAY TO PERMANENT PEACE

BY REAR-ADMIRAL F. E. CHADWICK, U. S. N.

THERE are many Peace Societies, both in our own country and elsewhere, persistently saying that war must cease, but all offer only ineffective solutions of the great question. They have been hammering away with half-measures for some years, and some of them for many years, and, as if it were a travesty upon their inefficiency, we have this world-wide war upon us. All these societies are wrong in so far that they offer only a medicament after the advent of trouble, and not a preventive. True hygiene is prevention, not cure.

It is almost axiomatic that by far the greatest cause of war is the struggle for special commercial advantage. It is for this that Japan is occupying Manchuria and excluding the rest of us; that France took Algeria, developed a colonial empire a third larger than the United States, and finally swallowed Morocco, despite the Convention of Algeciras (itself as solemn a treaty as that of 1839, which so many delight to harp upon), and in so doing developed by-products which made the present world-wide war a certainty. But France is far from being alone. All have struggled for these special spheres of influence, so that in these last thirty-odd years the lands of every race not up to our ideals of efficiency have been taken without so much as a "by your leave" to the occupants thereof or to the rest of the nations. What may be called the commons of the world have thus been inclosed by various nations, much as were, in times not long past, the commons of England. There were occasional "deals" between the Powers, but in the main it was simple seizure by the stronger. It is thus we have the Philippines—purchased from a nominal owner, it is true, but all the same purchased with a sword at his throat. It is thus by seizure or conquest, mostly in the last century, that Great Britain holds twenty-seven per cent. of the habitable lands of the world, and Russia another twenty per cent. Between the two they own nearly half the world. And Russia is now fighting for more.

She wants an open road to a warmer sea; she wants ports on the Mediterranean. She thus aims for Constantinople, for control of the Balkan States, for the ownership of Asia Minor. Is there not some arrangement which can satisfy her—and not her alone, but all nations seeking roads for commerce—without the accomplishment carrying with it control of races racially unlike their own? I think there is.

Elsewhere I have advocated as at least a great step in the prevention of war the abolition of anything like efforts to establish special spheres of influence, and to take steps toward the internationalization for trade purposes of all the regions seized since, say, 1880: in other words, to put all nations in these regions on an absolute equality as to trade and exploitation. This was accomplished for Morocco by the convention between Germany and France signed on November 4, 1911, by which complete equality of treatment was established, and not only that, but all disputes were to be settled by arbitration. All this was done, be it said, while Mr. Lloyd George and the London *Times* were talking war in the most inflammatory way over the Agadir incident.

Now what was done in Morocco, what exists in large degree in all British and German colonies, may and should, as a first step to universal peace, be applied by international arrangement to all the regions seized since 1880. We should thus have Manchuria, Mongolia, Madagascar, British, French, and German Africa (including Egypt, but excepting Algeria, Cape Colony, and Natal), the Philippines, Puerto Rico, etc., the whole amounting in area to more than twice the area of the United States, open to all nations on terms of equality as to trade. This arrangement would put an end to rivalry for possession. For why trouble to administer a region in which there is complete freedom to trade?

Such arrangement (and let it be said again that it exists, or did exist in Morocco, and nominally at least in the Congo) would be a long step toward general pacification. But it would be only one step, though a great one. Sea-borne commerce should be enabled to go as far as there is water to carry it, and this principle has been receiving gradual recognition now for many generations. There is no reason why the same right of way to all sea-going vessels in all rivers and estuaries should not apply as it now applies in the Chesapeake, the Cattegat, the Thames, and the Scheldt. Thus the Dardanelles should be opened to the use of all nations as much as the

Suez and Panama canals. This would, or should, go far to meeting the aspirations of Russia, for her whole southern border would thus have perfectly free access to the sea. It is but a reasonable concession to Russia's needs.

But there is still one more step which, no doubt wild-sounding to many, must come if we are to have world peace. It is the total abolition of the custom-house as a commerce preventer. When men can trade without let or hindrance everywhere, just as Maine can trade with California, we shall have taken away all cause for war among civilized nations. There will remain, of course, cause for international difficulties, such, for example, as exist in backward States like Mexico to-day, but such difficulties will in time cease naturally through education and civilization.

In our own country, so typically protective, we have established a free trade in all races of white men. There is no exclusion of Slav, Jew, Turk, Persian, Christian, or Mohammedan. In the nature of things the sons of these men will in time be the husbands of our daughters; their daughters the wives of our sons. Certainly such a free receptivity of people is much more drastic free trade than the free receptivity of their manufactures. But whether so or not, the main thesis—that war is in a general sense always the result of unequal opportunity in trade—holds good, and also that this inequality must be removed as a first step, the only real step, to anything like universal peace.

All logic is with the proposition. All will grant that trade has always been and remains the great civilizer, the great missionary. For trade, all roads, steamships, and railways exist; without it nations would have remained in darkest ignorance and savagery. Thus being the great and beneficent thing it is, the greatest lever in the uplift of mankind, the spreader of light and Christianity, it stands to reason that it is the greatest of errors to put trammels in its way.

Personally, I regard the proposition as absolutely sound economically; but, putting this part of the question aside, a continuance of the present world policies means a continuance of war. It is thus for the world to retain a specious and, in the view of many, a mistaken policy born of greed, with a continuance of war, or accept a principle in agreement with the spirit of brotherhood, which is the basis of all religions, and which means peace.

F. E. CHADWICK.